

Memorandum

Date: January 29, 1997

To: Lester, Steve, Judy, Stein, Rick B., Sharon

From: Rick Soehren

Subject: Achieving Consensus on Water Use Efficiency

Here's a summary of my meetings with CALFED management types on January 28 and 29, 1997.

EPA

Met with Patrick Wright, Karen Schwinn, Tom Hagler, Bruce Herbold, Carolyn Yale, and Nancy Yoshikawa in S.F. on Tuesday January 28. Highlights:

- Patrick suggested we refrain from forcing the issue on controversial assurance measures and concentrate on development of CALFED policies and programs that would result in an open and active water transfers market. He believes this will provide a significant assurance that conservation will occur, making it easier to reach agreement on other assurances.
- Tom suggested that the agricultural trigger threat must be credible to work. He recommended drafting the proposed Agricultural Water Management Planning Act now so that our alternative to a voluntary program is taken more seriously.
- Patrick places great importance on having a quantified acre-foot target for conserved water. We will develop a range of estimates for impact assessment. I cautioned him that this range will be based on several assumptions, it will be difficult to monitor achievement because there are so many factors that affect water demand, and it is my experience with urban agencies that they are very uncomfortable with targets for fear they will become mandates. Therefore, we should be careful how we portray and use such numbers. He was not sympathetic to my concerns.
- Karen, Patrick, and Tom are anxious to get information on the Phase II timeline. They have the uneasy feeling that they don't know what will happen when.

USBR

Met with Penny Howard on Wednesday January 29. She characterized what she told me as "where Roger [Patterson] is at". Highlights:

- Penny believes we will never achieve consensus on water conservation issues by listening to both sides, trying to balance, and making a decision. Positions are so passionately held that no one will accept our solution. She recommends that we tell BDAC that we need consensus on a definition of success and consensus on assurances that success will be achieved. She further advises that we select a new subcommittee of BDAC members representing all sides of the issues and give them two months to reach agreement.
- I expected Penny to object to inclusion of the ag MOU as a central part of our approach because its provision regarding measurement of water deliveries is inconsistent with the USBR criteria. She said no, she'd accept anything that a balanced consensus process came up with.
- Penny also suggests forming another new group to work through transfers issues.